A Sensational Affidavit: When Eliz. Bentley Called Her Autobiography "Fiction," See Page 2

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. IV, NO. 2 JANUARY 16, 1956 WASHINGTON, D. C. 15 CENTS

The Pope's Plea for Nuclear Disarmament Finds No Echo in Washington

As "Dynamic and Flexible" As A Dinosaur

The sterility of American politics is reflected in the absence of any response last week, either in the President's State of the Union Message or in Democratic criticisms of it, to the Christmas Eve proposals made by the Pope on nuclear disarmament. Except for a feeble Voice of America broadcast on December 29, the Vatican's appeal has been hastily brushed under the national rug. Yet the Pope's initiative strikingly changes the political balance of forces abroad and at home. His Holiness spoke just one day after informed sources in London let it be known that Nehru, with Soviet approval, was trying to promote new East-West talks on disarmament and for a ban on nuclear tests. One week after the Vatican's message, Bulganin warned against the delusion that the mutual possession by East and West of such terrible weapons automatically excluded their use; he suggested new talks in an effort to agree on their prohibition. The positions of Nehru, the Pope and Bulganin on nuclear disarmament are not the same; where they agree is where all thoughtful human beings agree, that this is the overwhelming menace of our time, and that new efforts must be made to cope with it. When neutralist India, the Catholic Pontiff and the Soviet Premier agree, the lineup of forces for new negotiations is formidable.

A Blow to Spellman and Meany

The Pope's initiative also changes the balance of forces at home and makes it politically feasible to adopt a more enlightened policy than brandishing bigger and better bombs. The Pope's message undercuts the one important popular bloc in American life favoring a belligerent foreign policy. The Vatican's initiative, and the terms in which it is couched, are a blow to men like Cardinal Spellman and George Meany who have identified Roman Catholicism in this country, not altogether fairly, with an inflammatory and intransigeant opposition to co-existence. It must be especially painful to the head of the AFL-CIO that ten days after his coarse and intemperate speech attacking "anti anti-communism," Nehru and neutralism, the supreme head of his Church should have chosen the most solemn moment of the Christian year to join forces with Nehru against nuclear tests, to survey the Communist East and the capitalist West with impartial eye, and to win the applause of Moscow and the Italian Left. Meany could hardly have been more surprised if he had caught Cardinal Spellman in a May Day parade.

The Vatican's initiative was not unprepared. The one Catholic member of our Atomic Energy Commission, Thomas E. Murray, has been at loggerheads with his fellow commissioners on the genetic dangers of new nuclear tests. The Pope's warnings against radioactivity echoed those made by Commissioner Murray on November 17 in a major address on the subject at Fordham University. Then, in a letter to the *New York Times* (Dec. 14), the Rev. Edward A. Conway, S.J., the first official Catholic observer at the United Nations, followed up the Murray speech with a plea for a "crash program" of atomic disarmament *this year*. Father Conway warned that the new Russian fission-fusion-fission bomb explosion of November 23 and Russian progress in the race for the intercontinental ballistic missile "have drastically telescoped the timetable for disarmament." Father Conway said the President's proposal for aerial reconnaissance would be worthless and "the ultimate impasse" reached once IBM's with atomic warheads had been deployed. Father Conway called for the suspension of election year politics on the ground that "the Administration would find it almost impossible to negotiate meaningfully with the Russians while fighting the Democrats in its rear."

What Did Stassen Tell the Pope?

There are signs that the scene was being set for important moves. According to the *New York Times* of December 30, Stassen as the White House assistant on disarmament discussed the problem with the Pope "several weeks ago." *L'Osservatore Romano* gave prominence on December 28 to reports from Washington that Eisenhower, Dulles and Stassen had discussed the Pope's message. There were rumors here that the President's message was being revised as a result of the Pope's initiative. But there was no sign in the message or anywhere else of any change in policy.

According to one report Stassen proposed that the U.S. call for a one year moratorium on further tests but was overruled by Dulles and the military. Dulles himself started the New Year by letting the *New York Times* know (Jan. 2), that it was still American policy to use nuclear weapons against aggression "no matter what weapons the aggressor chose." The President in his State of the Union message said our policy "must be dynamic as well as flexible" but the continued reliance on "the awesome power of the atom" which he enunciates is about as dynamic and flexible as a dinosaur. What's flexible about a weapon you can't use without killing yourself? Yet all the talk here is of a new "super H" bomb of 30 to 50 megatons soon to be tested, and Gen. Taylor at his first press conference last week emphasized modernization of the Army for atomic combat and an all-out effort to achieve a 1500-mile ballistic missile. Krishna Menon appeals to the U.S. to cancel the new bomb test and Dulles turns him down flat. Radford says we are prepared to use the atom bomb in Korea. For all our pretension to moral leadership, this capital is still run by small boy mentalities, fascinated by big firecrackers.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A Chance to Hit Back at the 20 Years of Treason Myth

The Challenge to the Democrats in the Taylor Vindication

An important aspect of the William Henry Taylor case is the cowardice of the Democratic party leadership which had so much to gain in his fight against the Elizabeth Bentley espionage charges. From Harry S. Truman down, not a single Democratic party figure lifted a finger to help Taylor, though his victory is the first major blow at the "20 Years of Treason" myth Attorney General Herbert Brownell and F.B.I. Chief J. Edgar Hoover launched two years ago. When the International Organizations Loyalty Board reversed itself (Jan. 6) and found there was no "reasonable doubt" about William Henry Taylor's loyalty, it also reversed Brownell and Hoover. Brownell on November 17, 1953, before the Senate Internal Security Committee declared Taylor guilty of espionage and Hoover vouched for Elizabeth Bentley's credibility.

The verdict was more than the vindication of a single individual. The Board reversed after hearing sworn testimony from two others—Frank Coe and Ludwig Ullmann—named by Brownell and Hoover as part of a supposed spy ring centering around the late Harry D. White. It heard the painstaking analysis of the discrepancies in the whole Bentley story by Taylor's courageous counsel, the former New Deal Congressman from California, Byron Scott. The Board was impressed when Scott discovered and McCarthy made available testimony before an executive session of the McCarthy committee in which Bentley denied she had ever known Taylor "personally," though she was supposed to have received secrets and those famous currency plates from him.

The clincher was a supposed letter by Ullmann to Taylor, which purported to prove that Ullmann got Taylor his job in the Treasury. The trouble with this letter is that two different carbon copies with different dates and texts got before the Board, and a third version with a third date and text seems to have been used by Roy Cohn before a Federal grand jury in December, 1952. The Board may have felt there was something fishy about a letter which appeared in so many different forms. Coe testified that he and not Ullmann got Taylor his job. Neither Taylor nor Ullmann remembered any such letter, and Ullmann said he didn't think he ever wrote it. Was this a forgery?

The Attorney General owes Taylor the apology his lawyer demands, and he has the power to open the 1952 grand jury minutes and investigate this mysterious letter. The Hennings subcommittee ought to subpoena Brownell, Hoover and Bentley and thoroughly examine this whole affair. Not the least important document is the affidavit we publish below, never made public before. It figured in Taylor's half million dollar libel suit against the Washington *Daily News* for calling him part of an espionage ring. The paper settled out of court just as trial was about to begin last Tuesday here in Washington. (Not a single newspaper covered the story.) If the Bentley story was in whole or part "fiction," the country has a right to know it, especially on the eve of a presidential campaign in which Brownell and Jenner have often threatened to serve up "warmed over spy."

Full Text of Sensational Affidavit in W. H. Taylor's Suit Against Wash. Daily News

Lawyer Swears Eliz. Bentley Called Her Supposed Autobiography "Fiction"

"State of Louisiana, Parish of St. Landry

"Be it known that on this seventeenth (17th) day of May in the year of Our Lord one thousand nine hundred and fifty-four (1954), the undersigned Notary Public in and for the parish and state aforesaid, there personally came and appeared HOWARD B. DEJEAN, JR., a resident of Opelousas, St. Landry Parish, Louisiana, who, after being duly sworn did depose and say:

I

"That he is an attorney at law practicing at Opelousas, St. Landry Parish, Louisiana, and as such was instrumental in affecting personal service on Miss Elizabeth T. Bentley as per a subpoena issued from the United States District Court for the Western District of Louisiana, and which said subpoena had been issued for the purpose of eliciting testimony in regard to that certain civil suit known as William H. Taylor vs. Washington Daily News in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, Civil Action No. 5394-53.

II

"That in keeping with the aforesaid subpoena there appeared at the office of appearer in the Shute Building, 220 South Court Street, Opelousas, Louisiana, on May 17, 1954, at one o'clock PM the following persons: Miss Elizabeth T. Bentley; counsel for Miss Bentley, a Mr. Lapeyre and a Mr. Weggman, who identified themselves as being New Orleans attorneys; Mr. Mark P. Friedlander, attorney for the defendant, Mr. Charles Walker, attorney for the defendant, both of Washington, D. C.; and the plaintiff in this cause, Mr. William H. Taylor, accompanied by his attorney, Mr. Byron N. Scott, of Washington, D. C.

III

"That certain testimony was elicited after numerous objections had been made by both counsel for Miss Bentley and for the defendant newspaper whereupon the attorneys entered into a discussion on the propriety of continuing this deposition at some later date when Miss Bentley would have available to her certain notes and documents for the purpose of refreshing her memory.

IV

"That during the time in which Mr. Byron N. Scott was enumerating into the record certain documents and evidences of public hearings, etc., which he would be interested in interrogating Miss Bentley about, he (Mr. Scott) referred to Miss Bentley's book, 'Out of Bondage', published by the Devin-Adair Company in 1951, whereupon Miss Bentley did, in the presence of said appearer and all other persons in attendance at the aforesaid taking of this deposition, say, 'I don't see why any reference is being made to my book, that's fiction', or certain words to the effect that her book hereinbefore referred to was fictional and not factual.

"THUS DONE AND SIGNED at my office at Opelousas, St. Landry Parish, Louisiana, on the date and place hereinbefore set forth in the presence of the hereinafter named and undersigned competent witnesses who have hereunto set their names after due reading of the whole.

(s) Howard B. DeJean, Jr.,
Signature of Appearer

WITNESSES:
(s) June W. Campbell
(s) Willie King

(s) Lillian Soileau
Notary Public

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A Proposal for Mr. Sulzberger in the Wake of His Jan. 5 Editorial

Why Not A Special Panel to Arbitrate Those *Times* Firings?

In the wake of the Eastland investigation it is a pleasure to report, as of the time we went to press, that the *New York Times* had discharged neither the editorial employes who pleaded the First amendment nor the press room employes who took the Fifth. Our hat is off to Mr. Sulzberger for the editorial in which our greatest newspaper finally fought back, and it is good to see how generally the press supported the *Times*, once it decided to defy Eastland.

Against this background, we offer a suggestion to Mr. Sulzberger. The *Times* discharged three men before it decided to fight, Melvin Barnet last summer, Seymour Peck and Nathan Aleskovsky last month. Why not make it possible for them to benefit retroactively by the principle that the paper will judge men "by the quality of their work?" Would it not be a fine and honorable gesture to set up a small panel of three men, a newspaperman of high standing, a lawyer of stature and perhaps a member of Congress. Let this panel decide on the basis of the evidence whether these three men were guilty of any dereliction of duty as employes of the *Times* and decide whether they should be reinstated. Should their careers be destroyed and their bread taken from them because the *New York Times* was a little slow in taking the position it finally did? And, we might add, why should the *Times* lose three very capable employes? Would readers pass this suggestion on to Mr. Sulzberger?

We intend to return to this subject when the *Newspaper Guild* decides what it will do in the cases of Bill Price of the *Daily News* and Dan Mahoney of the *Mirror*, both discharged after their appearance before the committee. We have space now only to praise the New York City Civil Liberties Union for its statement on freedom of the press, which contrasted refreshingly with the ambiguities of that issued by the national organization. Finally we make our bow to Walter Lippmann for clearing the air with his great column of January 10 on why it is the duty of newspapermen to fight Congressional inquisition; Mr. Lippmann, with his unequalled perspicacity, argued the case for the traditional and absolute libertarian point of view to which our own lonely pages are devoted.

Elections in Our "Free World"

"Guatemala had national elections last week . . . an election in which the cards were all stacked in favor of the Castillo government. The result . . . was that the Administration bloc won all 66 Congressional seats. . . . No opposition parties participated . . . the vote was extremely light . . . illiterates—a large majority of the voters—were not allowed a secret ballot and had to vote orally and publicly. This meant, of course, they had to vote for the government. . . . Yet the great nation of India . . . proved several years ago that there could be democratic election for a largely illiterate electorate."

—New York Times editorial, Dec. 29

"The chairmen and members of the election boards totally ignored the most elementary rules of voting procedure. . . . The election boards received explicit orders to count 98 percent for Diem and 2 percent for Bao Dai. . . . The system of open baskets (into which the voters were made to throw their ballots carrying the name of Bao Dai) placed under the vigilant surveillance of the police, has no parallel anywhere in the world. . . . For the coming legislative elections, the candidates must present a complete dossier with a certificate of loyalty issued by the government, which will automatically eliminate all opposition and non-official candidates."

—Pham Van Ngoi, secretary of the Socialist Party of Vietnam, describing the recent elections there in Labor Action, December 19.

Too Many Informers for Their Own Good

". . . the secret military police forced so many Japanese to become secret informers that they defeated their own purpose. Thousands of informers with no real knowledge smothered counterintelligence with so many reports and documents that it was impossible to study and appraise them with any degree of accuracy. I am convinced it was this passion for investigating petty espionage that enabled . . . [Richard] Sorge . . . to escape discovery for so long."

—Quoted from "The Man With Three Faces" by Hans-Otto Meissner in a review by Tom Donnelly, Washington Daily News, Jan. 7.

There is no way to have a free press without permitting "subversive" views, whether those of Communists in a capitalist society or of "counter-revolutionaries" in a Communist society. Experience has shown that an exception, once made starts a momentum toward total and abject conformity. In our own immediate situation here in America, we can see how this works. It is perfectly obvious that no major newspaper or newspaper writer in this atmosphere will dare espouse openly Communist views. One must therefore watch for opinions which, while not Communist, may aid them or (in the opinion of the secret police) move in the same direction. One must then determine whether a man who attacked secret informers did so because he secretly sympathizes with the Communists or from sincere conviction. J. Edgar Hoover and Senator Eastland think a network of "pseudo-liberals" were set in motion by the Communists in the Matusow affair. The *New York Times* and the *Alsops* attacked secret informers. Were they "pseudo" or "genuinely" liberal in doing so? This is the real question the witch hunters raise and this is not a question which can really be answered. To permit the question to be raised is to permit the State to police opinion, and if certain opinions are to be suspect then it is safer not to voice them. These dangerous opinions, notice, are not Communist but liberal. The momentum has already taken us quite a way.

A Sheaf of Victories

Within the space of a few days, there has been a series of victories for civil liberties. There was the Taylor vindication, which we discussed on page two. Federal Judge Bailey Aldrich in Boston acquitted Leon J. Kamin of contempt, and his decision will probably also free Associate Professor Wendell H. Furry of Harvard. Both men admitted past membership in the Communist party but declined to become informers before the McCarthy committee. Here in the District, the Court of Appeals (speaking through Judge Prettyman, who sits on the far right of the bench politically) reversed the perjury conviction of Louis Weinstock, one of the original Smith Act defendants. The Court held that an alleged misstatement by Weinstock before the Subversive Activities Control Board was of too little importance to be "material." In Cleveland, a Federal judge directed a verdict of acquital for one Smith Act defendant and indicated that he might free another. In Connecticut, where another Smith Act trial is going on, the Judge has ruled that the defense can examine the FBI reports in the case. Best of all, the Veterans Administration was forced by public pressure to rescind the move to deprive James Kutcher, the legless war veteran, of his pension on the ground that a secret informer *said he said* critical things about the government during the Korean war. Special mention is due Joseph L. Ruth, Jr., Kutcher's counsel, for the vigor with which he argued the case. We hope to say more about its implications later, and about the need for a campaign to get Kutcher's government job back.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Two Key Groups—Farmers and Negroes—Disappointed by the President's Program

The Chances Are That Eisenhower Will Not Run

Will the President run again? The question is so fascinating that the eager microscopic analyses of the experts tend to overlook the obvious. Mr. Eisenhower said on leaving Key West, "it is not merely . . . what the doctors say to me" and went on to stress the danger of something "untoward" happening when there is an unexpected change in the Presidency. This means that he, rather than the doctors, will make his decision and that he will not run if he fears he cannot survive another term. My guess is that he will not run, and that he will be swayed by the thought that he can still exercise a beneficial influence from outside the White House in the cause of peace.

Whom will the Republicans run? There is general agreement here that they can win only with Warren. If Warren cannot be prevailed upon to run, the Eastern seaboard Eisenhower Republicans will pick a "liberal" Republican and garnish him with the name of Eisenhower by putting the President's brother, Milton, into the second place. Among the "dark horse" possibilities, Governor Knight of California has the advantage of labor support, of being in the Warren image, and of undercutting Knowland. Governor Stratton of Illinois might draw votes in that key state from Adlai Stevenson. Herter of Massachusetts and Stassen are also hopeful. As for Nixon, it is recognized that his nomination would be a party disaster.

How does the State of the Union Message affect the political outlook? Very poorly for the Republicans. The only issues at the moment that count decisively in the political scales are domestic, and both are minority issues—farm relief and Negro rights. The message was disappointing to both the farmers and the Negroes. The best barometer of farm opinion was the disappointed reaction of Congressman Hope, Republican, Kansas, former chairman of the House Agriculture Committee, "I am sorry that there is nothing in the message which holds out any hope of increased farm income for 1956 when farmers need it so badly."

What of the Negro? Like every other minority trying to change its status, he finds both parties playing to the (white) majority. (In this respect his position is like that of Israel, which finds both East and West playing for the favor of the Arab majority). All Eisenhower offered to meet the situation "in some [localities] where allegations persist" (Are the Mississippi murders mere allegations?) that Negro rights are being violated is a commission of inquiry to be "created by the Congress." This is double buck-passing, (1) to a commission and (2) to Congress. The Republicans, if they were willing to drop the new millionaires of Texas, might win an election by a bold civil rights program, for the Nego vote holds the balance of power in several key States. But there is no sign of such a program.

Where can the Negro turn? The furthest that Adlai Stevenson would venture when asked about the commission idea on "Face The Nation" last Sunday was a sideswipe at Brownell. "I should imagine," Stevenson said, "the agencies at the command of the Attorney General are quite sufficient to determine the facts, if that is all this commission is intended to do." Then he added, "Maybe the commission is intended to investigate the Attorney General. If so, I would say that I would defer to the President's greater wisdom." An essential bipartisan indifference leaves the Negro little choice between the two parties. This means the Democrats will continue to get most of his vote in the North, as the party more favorable to the poorer elements.

Will peace play no role in the election? Only vaguely. The most encouraging poll of the week was Gallup's survey of Republican county chairman (published January 6) which showed that of 2,853 polled and 1,683 who answered, the largest number, 1,170, said "peace" was the strongest argument their party could use against the Democrats. (Only 186 cited "the Republican record" and nobody seems to have cited the supposed "cleaning out of Communists" from the government). But "peace" still seems to mean Korea, for only 70 mentioned "foreign policy" and there is no sign that the Democrats are prepared to exploit the peace sentiment by taking the offensive against the Republicans on foreign policy. The liberal democrats are pressing for higher military expenditures and the conservative Democrats for lower foreign aid. And nobody, but nobody, criticizes H-bomb policy. The Bomb is our national totem, and talk of it is taboo.

Toynbee on the German Problem

Even Senator George on "Reporters' Roundup" (MBS) last Monday night parrotted the State Department nonsense about Geneva having "proved" that there could be no reunification of Germany "except on Russian terms." Compare this American "party line" rubbish with the considered opinion of the conservative historian Toynbee in Colliers (Jan. 20):

"Germany can be reunited only by the common consent of Russia and the West, and surely it is evident now that the only condition on which we shall be able to agree on the reestablishment of a power that is potentially so formidable is a self-denying ordinance by which we give one another a mutual pledge not to admit Germany into either camp. It would allay both Russian and West European fears."

Why Not Give A Gift Subscription to Your Local Newspaper Editor?

I. F. Stone's Weekly, 301 E. Capitol, Wash. 3, D. C.
Please renew (or enter) my sub for the enclosed $5:*

Name .....

Street .....

City .....Zone.....State.....

Enter gift sub for $2 (6 mos.) or $4 (1 yr.) additional:

(To) Name .....

Street .....

City .....Zone.....State.....

* extra for Canada. 1/16/56

I. F. Stone's Weekly
Room 205
301 E. Capitol St., S. E.
Washington 3, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

Entered as Second Class Mail Matter Washington, D. C. Post Office

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED